

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/627,424 | UCHIDA ET AL | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Steven D. Maki | 1733 | |

All Participants:

(1) Steven D. Maki.

(2) James W. Hellwege.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 May 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

none

Prior art documents discussed:

none


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner made courtesy call to applicant's representative and left voice mail message informing him that the after final response filed 4-18-05 does not place the case in condition for allowance and that an advisory action will be mailed. Examiner specifically informed applicant's representative that the 132 declaration filed 4-18-05 is not timely and will not be entered since (1) examiner had informed applicant in the office actions dated 6-3-04 and 6-12-03 that unexpected results for entire range of 0.1 to 5 mm have not been shown and (2) no new ground of rejection was made in the final office action dated 11-16-04 . .